DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 934 IR 006 478

AUTHOR	Gothberg, Helen M.
TITLE	Training Library Communication Skills: Development of Three Video Tape Workshops. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Arizona Univ., Tucson.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Office of Libraries and Learning Resources.
BUREAU NO	475AH60029
PUB DATE	Nov 77
GRANT	G007603016
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Communication Skills; Educational Games; Instructional Media; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Librarians; Media Selection; Role Playing; Teaching Methods; *Videotape Recordings; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Immediacy; *Reference Interview

ABSTRACT

The development and evaluation of materials for a series of three workshops designed to increase the interpersonal communication skills of the librarian during the reference interview are described. The completed package for this project, "Librarians Communicate," consisted of a three-part 51-minute videocassette tape and a 50-page instruction manual. This report includes the background literature on which some decisions were based, as well as the instructional design plan and strategies used for needs assessment, objective setting, media selection, presentation strategy selection, field testing, and evaluation. Discussions of the testing and evaluation results and limitations of this study are included, and further research into types of instructional materials is recommended. A 24-item bibliography and copies of the product verification instruments are provided. (JVP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED163934

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 475AH60029
Grant No. G007603016

TRAINING LIBRARY COMMUNICATION SKILLS: DEVELOPMENT OF THREE VIDEO TAPE WORKSHOPS

Helen M. Gothberg, Ph. D

University of Arizona

Tucson, Arizona

November 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Juanita F. Bowe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

IR006 478

US. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Office of Libraries and Learning Resources

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the librarians Communicate project was to develop materials for a series of workshops dealing with interpersonal communication during the reference interview. These workshops deal with a communication construct known as "Immediacy," are intended to be group participatory in nature, and are supported through the medium of video tape, supplemented by printed materials, when used by an in-person group leader. These materials were field tested and revised using an Instructional Design Plan and Learner Verification Model. The project was carried out at the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona in cooperation with the Radio-TV-Film Bureau of the University and the University Library.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge those librarians and content evaluators who were willing to take their time to work with the project materials and those individuals who helped to evaluate them. I also extend my appreciation to the librarians and students who participated in the video tape productions for their patience and good humor. A very special thanks to David Laird, University of Arizona Librarian, who good naturedly put up with the convolutions of television production in the Library Media Center.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT i

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES..... 5

A. THE SERIES..... 5

B. THE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES..... 5

C. THE LEADER'S ROLE..... 6

D. THE INSTRUCTIONAL MANUAL..... 6

E. VIDEO PRODUCTION..... 7

1. OUTLINE..... 7

2. PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES..... 7

3. PRODUCTION SCHEDULE..... 9

F. PROGRAM CONTENT AND LOGISTICS.....11

1. LEARNING METHODOLOGY.....11

2. THE INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS.....11

a. PART I: VERBAL COMMUNICATION.....11

b. PART II: NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION.....12

c. PART III: THE REFERENCE INTERVIEW.....12

III. DATA COLLECTION AND RESULTS.....14

A. FIELD TESTING AND VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.....14

1. THE DESIGN PLAN OF THE STUDY 14

2. THE INSTRUMENTS OF VERIFICATION.....14

3. VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.....15

B. RESULTS OF FIELD TESTING AND VERIFICATION.....15

1. CONTENT VERIFICATION.....15

2. GROUP LEADER VERIFICATION.....16

3. PARTICIPANT VERIFICATION.....16

C. PROJECT EVALUATION.....17

D. PROJECT REVISION.....18

1. THE VIDEO PROGRAM.....18

2. THE PRINTED MATTER.....18

IV. SUMMARY.....20

A. SUMMARY STATEMENT.....20

B. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....22

C. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....23

D. PUBLICITY.....25

1. LOCAL AND STATE-WIDE.....25

2. REGIONAL.....26

3. NATIONAL.....26

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....27

VI. APPENDICES.....29

A. LETTER OF PERMISSION.....29

B. INSTRUMENTS OF VERIFICATION AND COVER LETTER.....30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the video tape project Librarians Communicate was to develop and test three two-hour workshops in communication skills for reference librarians and others. The completed package consisted of a three-part 51-minute video cassette tape and a 50-page Instructional Manual. The project was undertaken in the fall of 1976 and completed by the end of summer 1977 at the University of Arizona in Tucson. It involved the efforts and cooperation of personnel in the Graduate Library School, Radio-TV-Film Bureau and Main University Library.

The goal of this project was to provide teachers and workshop leaders with a viable training tool for the development of certain communication skills found useful in reference. The video tape provided subject content and demonstrated reference interaction with librarians and patrons. The manual assured optimal use of the video programs through suggested workshop structure and elective activities. These activities included discussions, games and exercises, and role-play.

There were four basic objectives in undertaking the Librarians Communicate project. The first was to develop more innovative teaching practices, and particularly to make use of the newer media, such as video tape. The second was to provide future and practicing reference librarians, and also public service para-professionals, with an opportunity to develop a communication style which promotes dialog with the patron. The third objective was to test whether it was feasible to utilize the video medium as a support system for workshops in communication; and fourth, to make whatever revisions were needed as a result of field testing and evaluation. The four objectives were based on the recognition that our rapidly changing world not only demands new methodologies and ideas for the education and training of the "new breed" of librarian, it also demands both a practical and a wider dissemination of such information to library schools and practicing librarians.

Some of the background out of which this project evolved is founded on the growth and development of reference as a complex process involving many facets--including the study of human dialog. In the past, librarianship focused primarily on the organization, storage and maintenance of information. Interest in information retrieval and communication processes is a recent phenomenon. Early concepts of reference work were described as being Conservative, Moderate and Liberal or Ideal (Wyer, 1930), or in terms of Elementary, Intermediate and Advanced levels of work (Butler, 1943). Such theories or models of reference ultimately proved inadequate,

since they were limited to how much time and work was involved in answering a patron's question. Later concepts of reference as a service activity evolved out of the post-war era and the growth of information. In this period reference was variously called the "Fourth 'R' of Learning" (Shores, 1964) and the "prepotent achievement of modern humanism in Library Service" (Ranganathan, 1964:31).

Not all of the skills needed for effective reference librarianship are contained in a knowledge of reference tools or a concept of service. The literature of reference librarianship provides insight into some of the complexities of question-negotiation which is carried out at the reference desk. That encounter between a seeker of documentary knowledge, a library user, and the organizational complexities of a library's resources has come to be viewed as a "process" involving tools, service, library organization --and human communication. Taylor (1968), for example, noted that as more and more of the technical processes in the library are handled by automated means, it becomes increasingly important for librarians to interpret and guide the communication process during the reference interview. Vavrek (1968; 1969) challenged modern reference librarians to focus on activities that contributed to the flow of information. He envisioned the reference librarian as a specialist able to instruct users in the "how to" approach in an information search, and also able to bring about meaningful dialog between himself and the patron. Galvin (1975) insisted that there must be a new generation of reference librarians, deeply sensitive to the negotiation of the reference inquiry, and that it was up to the library schools to produce them.

Bringing about meaningful dialog between individuals involved in an information search is not, however, a simple matter. Taylor (1968) noted that the level of frustration in using libraries is high for most people. Mount (1966) supported Taylor's position and identified several reasons for a user's failure to ask the right questions during the reference interview. The reluctance of a library user to even approach librarians with questions was also observed. A study by Plummer (1971) of student difficulty in using the card catalog stated, that, although students encountered problems in either finding appropriate subject headings or in interpreting symbols in the catalog, they were reluctant to approach the librarians whose responsibility it was to provide reference service. "Students apparently considered the librarian as a last resort," Plummer observed (1971:28).

It was suggested by some writers that the failure of reference librarians to interact in a meaningful way with the user, that is, to lessen user frustration in utilizing a library's resources, was a failure to recognize the negotiation of the reference question as primarily a communication activity. Penland (1971) noted that although librarians have not been trained in communication skills, the reference staff must become increasingly effective in promoting the crucial

interface between the user and his or her information needs as both become more complex. "However," Penland observed, "this interface has unfortunately seldom if ever been considered a communication endeavor" (1971:69).

The notion that the reference interview might be facilitated through a more genuinely supportive relationship on the part of a reference librarian is not new. In 1876 Samuel Swett Green wrote about "Personal Relations Between Librarians and Readers" in the Library Journal; and in one of the older standard texts for the education of librarians in reference, Hutchins (1944) stressed the need to establish cordial relations with the user. Statements of a more recent concern are reflected in Mosher's observation: "Unless the librarian can inspire the confidence of the patron, he may be a failure as a reference librarian, even though he can answer any question ..." (1964:328); and by Sammet (1969), a psychiatrist and former librarian, who urged librarians to increase their awareness of the user's emotional state.

A number of ideas can be found in the professional literature which suggest ways and means of improving communication at the reference desk. It is important here to recognize that there is no one way that will be effective for all individuals under many conditions. Pritchard (1971), for example, listed eighteen points for reference librarians to follow in developing sensitivity to the user; Peck (1975) suggested that some of the methods of counseling, such as Empathy, Attentive Behavior, and Content Listening could be significant; and Swope and Katzer (1972) believed that eye contact and a sincere smile on the part of a reference librarian encouraged questions that might not otherwise be asked.

Some of these suggestions are based on the literature of human relations, rather than human communication, per se. It seemed, however, that the purposes of the video tape project might best be served in dealing less with general attitudes and more with specific communication techniques. Many studies (Barnlund, 1968) in the field of communication suggested that human dialog is essentially a learned, rather than an innate behavior, thereby giving impetus to this belief. Although attitudes and belief systems are also subject to change through education, the process is rather more involved than what could realistically be accomplished in the span of three workshops and/or six hours of training.

Previous research by the project director suggested that the investigations of Mehrabian (1971) and his co-workers into the immediacy principle would provide a construct useful to the video tape project. Immediacy and nonimmediacy provided specific verbal and nonverbal cues which indicated a quality of liking or closeness in an interpersonal relationship. Verbal phrases which suggest

feelings of closeness; and nonverbal cues, such as eye contact and gestures, were explicit and based on a body of carefully researched data. Subsequent testing of the immediacy principle in the reference interview (Gothberg, 1974) suggested that a library user, when exposed to the immediate communication of a librarian, is more satisfied with the reference interview, and with his/her own ability to negotiate the reference question, than when exposed to a librarian's non-immediate communication.

The three-part video tape of the Librarians Communicate project was subsequently produced using the immediacy principle as the focus for communication skill in the negotiation of the reference question. Originally planned as a three-cassette project with brief Study Guide, field testing and revision subsequently resulted in a single tape, consisting of three parts and an expanded Instructional Manual.

Chapter One has covered introductory remarks concerning the nature of the video tape project Librarians Communicate. This chapter has listed the major objectives in undertaking the study. It has also provided the background literature for the premises on which decisions as to structure and content of the tapes were made. The next chapter, Chapter Two, will cover the methods and procedures involved in developing the package.

The remainder of the Final Report will be organized as follows: Chapter Three will cover the methodology and results of field testing. In addition, it will discuss the nature of the revisions of the project which were subsequently undertaken as a result of field testing and evaluation. Chapter Four is the summary chapter and will make recommendations for additional research and demonstration. Publicity about the project appears in this chapter as well as remarks about the limitations and conclusions of the study. A Bibliography and the Appendix materials follow the last chapter.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Chapter Two will cover the methods and procedures that were used to develop the Librarians Communicate project. In this chapter the workshop series will be described in more detail, including individual program objectives and the on-site workshop leader's/teacher's role. Production activities and the content of the original program prior to field testing and revision will be outlined.

A. The Series

Librarians Communicate is a three-part series of workshops which deal with human communication in a library or media center. The package is primarily intended for the in-service training of reference and public service staffs, and for supplemental learning in reference courses. The project enables teachers and/or workshop leaders to provide communication training using the support systems of videotape and instructional manual. Each part of the tape provides the basis of a two-hour workshop when used as directed. The series is intended for use by individuals without special training in the field of communication, and only minimal preparation is needed prior to use.

The Librarians Communicate workshops provide participants with explanation and instructed observation of communication behavior through the medium of video tape. The Instructional Manual provides the workshop leader or teacher with the necessary information to guide participants through a series of participatory activities designed to help students learn more about their own communication style.

The principle focus of the workshops is on how to facilitate human communication in the early stages of the reference interview in order to generally improve dialog with the public through the use of a more "immediate" communication style on the part of the librarian.

B. The Program Objectives

Part I: Verbal Communication.
Objectives: To help participants improve their verbal communication ability, and particularly to increase their immediate verbal communication.

Part II: Nonverbal Communication.

Objectives: To help participants become

more aware of nonverbal cues as a means of communication and especially to help librarians and others to increase their nonverbal immediacy.

Part III: The Reference Interview.

Objectives: To introduce participants to a librarian's communication style which is immediate and/or nonimmediate during the reference interview, and to understand the effect of these contrasting styles on the user.

C. The Leader's Role

Librarians Communicate is not intended to be a passive viewing activity. It was the goal of the project to provide information and increase awareness of communication style through both viewing and participatory activity. For this reason the role of the workshop leader or teacher must be an active one. Each part of the tape was developed to allow for activities to take place prior, during and/or following the video presentation. These activities include discussions, role-play, games, and exercises to be directed by the in-person group leader. Specific directions for these activities appear under each Program Unit in the Instructional Manual.

The video program units have one or more built-in stops. The purpose of these stops is to allow for the integration of the information presented through discussion and simulated experiences. These stops are signaled by the appearance of a slide and music cue on the video monitor. This slide is divided into four parts with different individuals speaking. A colored gel and the words, "librarians communicate" are superimposed over the black and white photograph. The photograph was used with the permission of the University of Denver, where it first appeared on a brochure for the Speech Communication Department. (See Appendix A). When this slide appears on the screen, it is a signal to the leader to stop the video tape and lead the group in one or more suggested activities.

D. The Instructional Manual

The Instructional Manual is a 50-page document designed for the use of leaders/teachers of the Librarians Communicate workshops. It describes the series, lists the objectives, outlines the leader's role, and makes general suggestions for workshop preparation and presentation. The Manual also provides some information on the operation of video equipment. In addition to these general guide-

lines, the Instructional Manual suggests a range of activities for each of the program units, and provides a number of alternative choices. Specific directions are given for these activities, and supplementary resources for games and exercises are included. A Guide to Suggested Readings for both leaders and participants is appended.

E. Video Production

1. Outline

The original production was planned and carried out as a series of three video tapes--one for each workshop. The video tape productions were produced by The Graduate Library School in cooperation with the Radio-TV-Film Bureau of the University of Arizona. The Project Director wrote the scripts and planned the production with a member of the Bureau who was assigned as Producer-Director. In the original series, the first two programs were taped in the university's television studio, and the third was a remote production, taped in the Media Center of the Main University Library. Engineers on the project were part of the regular Public Service Broadcasting station crew, housed in the university, with call letters KUAT. Floor crews were advanced students in the Radio-TV-Film Bureau's educational program. Two librarians from the University Library were assigned to the production as "actors," and several students and/or former students from the Graduate Library School and the R-TV-Film Bureau participated as "patrons." Narration for the program was primarily spoken by the Project Director with title openings narrated by a member of the Bureau.

Following a period of testing and evaluation, a program revision meeting was held, and the original project revised. The final production resulted in one 51-minute three-part video tape, all of which was taped on location in the University Library. The Librarians Communicate program was video taped on two-inch quad color and later reduced to three-quarter inch cassette. Such reduction normally insures a high quality of picture color and resolution.

2. Production Activities

The initial meeting between the Project Director and the Bureau's Program Projects Supervisor in early September resulted in the outline of the general schedule for video production. Due to other committments the Bureau had previously made, production could not start until December or January. Budget considerations were discussed, and it appeared feasible to tape in color, rather than in black and white, as originally planned. The Program Projects Supervisor also assigned the Producer-Director to the Librarians

Communicate project. The Producer-Director directed all of the video productions and acted as consultant to the Project Director. In addition, the Producer-Director scheduled facilities, made crew assignments, and supervised all post production activities including editing and final packaging. During this same period the Project Director was contacted about conducting communication workshops for personnel at the Tucson Public Library. This activity was part of a management development program for Librarian III's and offered an opportunity to design and try out two workshops as proto-types prior to actual video production.

The original proposal called for three video tapes to be produced: Tape I: Verbal Communication; Tape II: Nonverbal Communication; and Tape III: The Reference Interview. The production plan called for the Project Director and two librarians from the University Library to demonstrate communication styles before the camera, supplemented by lecture and explanatory material. It was decided that the first two tapes would provide both content for the workshops and set a tyle for simulated, or laboratory-type, communication instruction. That is, in addition to lecture, the director would demonstrate on camera certain games and exercises with the librarians. The librarians, in turn, would demonstrate communication styles and role-play activities. The third tape on the reference interview would be an integration of the learning activities of the first two tapes and would show the librarians in actual reference interviews in the library using a variety of communication styles. The decision to develop the video tape production in this way was based on the knowledge that most of the intended workshop leaders would have limited or no experience in directing communication interaction as a laboratory experience.

A planning meeting in mid-February with the Producer-Director resulted in the decision to do a studio production for the first two tapes and a remote--that is, a library location, for the third. Studio productions are less complex operations because they do not involve camera set-ups, and cost about two-thirds less than a remote production. Regular script meetings were held with the Producer-Director and suggestions for changes and revisions worked out as rehearsals progressed. An opportunity to try out ideas and to see how they looked on tape, prior to studio production, was made possible through the use of a small Instructional Television facility (ITV) located in the Math Building on campus. This facility was under the supervision of Bureau personnel. Once the tapes were produced, a Study Guide was developed to aid group leaders and supplement the video tapes. These materials were then field tested and revised. A more detailed description of this evaluation activity and the results appears in Chapter Three.

The production moved forward as scheduled with only some minor- and no real major problems encountered. A minor delay came about when it was not possible to video tape the second program on schedule due to camera failure. The production was rescheduled. Although this delay put the project slightly behind schedule, it was not a major problem in reaching most of the evaluators. The planned revision also ran somewhat behind schedule due to the delay of the evaluators returning materials on time--and summer vacations. Prior to program revision one of the librarians earned an administrative internship and moved some distance from the project site. She was, however, able to return for a brief period and participate in the final taping.

An outline for the production schedule follows in the next section. A more detailed description of the original three workshops produced for the Librarians Communicate project is described in section four.

3. Production Schedule

September	1	Introductory meeting with the Program Projects Supervisor.
December	3	Initial planning session with the Producer-Director, assigned by the Program Projects Supervisor.
"	30	Meeting with Tucson Public Library Deputy Director on communication workshops.
January	5	First proto-type workshop: Verbal Communication.
"	10	First script due to Producer-Director.
"	17	Planning meeting with Producer-Director.
"	24	Planning meeting with librarians and Producer-Director.
"	27	Rehearsal for Tape I in Math ITV
February	8	Second rehearsal for Tape I in Math ITV
"	9	Second proto-type workshop: Nonverbal Communication.
"	11	Studio rehearsal for Tape I.

"	15	Studio production: Tape I. Second script due to Producer-Director.
"	22	Rehearsal for Tape II in Math ITV.
"	28	Studio rehearsal for Tape II.
March	1	Studio production: Tape II. Cancelled due to camera failure, rescheduled for April 5.
"	10	Library site determined by remote crew.
"	19	Third script due to Producer-Director.
"	22	Rehearsal for Tape III in Math ITV.
"	23	Rehearsal in Media Center for Tape II.
"	26	Rehearsal in Media Center with lay-out of cameras by Producer-Director.
"	27	Remote production: Tape III.
"	31	Rehearsal for Tape II in main studio.
April	5	Studio production. Tape II: Nonverbal Communication.
"	10	Video cassette duplicated and Study Guide ready for mailing to evaluators with June 1 return date.
July	27	Program evaluation meeting.
August	1	Script revision meeting with Manager for Instructional Services and Producer-Director.
"	5	Revised script evaluation meeting with Producer-Director and the Program Projects Supervisor.
"	10	Script due to Producer-Director.
"	14	Rehearsal for revised script.
"	15	Second rehearsal for revised script.
"	16	Remote production, Media Center, University Library.
September	1	Editing and final production complete.

" 15 Repackaging of video tape materials.

November 15 Final report and revised Instructional Manual completed.

The time period from the first of September to the end of April is described in Chapter Two, which deals with the Methods and Procedures of the Librarians Communicate project. The period covered from the end of July through September is reported in the third chapter on Data Collection and Results. The nature of the three workshops prior to revision is described in section F below:

F. Program Content and Logistics

1. Learning Methodology

Fundamental to teaching communication skills is the notion that in order to understand communication processes, it is necessary to experience them firsthand. Therefore, in regard to the learning methodology of the workshops, two methods were used. The first was to provide content about immediate/nonimmediate communication at the reference desk, and the second was to provide workshop leaders/teachers with a model for leading group participation simulation exercises. Goldberg and Larson (1975) note that there is certainly some indication that some learning occurs in laboratory group experiences that is difficult, if not impossible, to learn in any other way.

2. The Individual Programs

a. Part I: Verbal Communication

The program opened on the three participants, that is, the two librarians and the Project Director seated in a semi-circle around an informal setting with a coffee table. This area was designated "the host area," and was one of two scenes used in the production. The other area consisted of a desk and chair and was designated "the role-play area." The backdrops for both settings were simple, open, wooden designs.

The opening of the program combined both direct lecture to the video audience by the Project Director and interaction with the two librarians. This activity was interrupted by exercises dealing with roles and communication style. These exercises were carried out in front of the camera, in order to set a style which would be followed up by the workshop audience under the direction of the group leader. Time was given to setting the background for the content, including some elaboration on other constructs, such as transactional

analysis, counseling techniques and semantics. Some comments by the Project-Director were addressed to the intended video audience.

Once the immediacy principle was introduced, the librarians moved to the role-play area and demonstrated the four categories of verbal immediacy. They later carried out reference role-plays with both immediate and nonimmediate verbal cues. In these role plays one of the librarians took the part of "librarian" and the other one the part of "patron." Only minimal props were used. Comments about how the librarians felt about the role-plays, both in their parts as librarian and as patron, were solicited from the Project-Director. Stopping points for group interaction were signaled by the appearance of the "Librarians Communicate" slide and music cue. These breaks provided an opportunity for the in-person leader to work with the target audience in the same way that had been demonstrated on the video monitor. The initial Part I on Verbal Immediacy of the Librarians Communicate program ran 43 minutes in length.

b. Part II: Nonverbal Communication

Part II was carried out using essentially the same design and setting. It opened with a lecture and interaction with the librarians on the topic of nonverbal communication, using demonstrated exercises to warm up the audience to concepts of body language. Nonverbal immediacy categories were demonstrated by the librarians with comments by the Project Director. The tape closed with the same verbal role plays as in Tape I, but this time with the nonverbal cues added. One technique introduced in this tape was to have the in-person group leader play the role-play section on the video monitor without sound and have the audience try to write the narrative script based on the nonverbal cues alone. The initial Part II on Nonverbal Immediacy of the Librarians Communicate Program ran 34 minutes/15 seconds in length.

c. Part III: The Reference Interview

The third tape was a location production in the Media Center of the Main Library of the University of Arizona. A new building, the setting was bright and attractive. For this part of the Librarians Communicate program, three additional individuals were asked to play the part of patrons. They were rehearsed as to the topic of information requested and as to their movements on camera. They did not know, however, that the librarians would be demonstrating different types of communication styles using the immediacy principle. The two librarians demonstrated a total of five interviews: two immediate, two nonimmediate, and one inconsistent or incongruent message; that is, immediate verbal cues and non-

immediate, nonverbal cues. The Project Director introduced the program briefly and later visited with the "patrons" in an unrehearsed interview regarding their personal reactions to the librarians' varied communication styles. The main activity for the workshop audience in this final program was to rate the librarians on an immediacy/nonimmediacy score sheet, playing the tape first with sound--and secondly without sound. Activities included discussions and follow-up role-play activities to be directed by the in-person group leader. The Reference Interview part of Librarians Communicate ran 24 minutes /15 seconds in length.

This chapter has covered the methods and procedures used to develop the Librarians Communicate series of workshops. It has described the package of the workshop series and program objectives, as well as defined the leader's role. Video production activities were described prior to field testing and evaluation, and the program content and logistics of the three original tapes were explained. In the next chapter, Chapter Three, the methods of field testing and evaluation will be covered along with the results on which revisions were based.

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION AND RESULTS

The present chapter deals with the utilization of a learner verification model to field test the Librarians Communicate Program. It also covers the resulting revision of the video tape program and the Instructional Manual.

A. Field Testing and Verification Procedures

1. The Design Plan of the Study

Using an instructional design plan and learner verification model, field testing and evaluation were carried out from mid-April to mid-July. An instructional design plan requires that a systematic approach be taken in the development of instructional technology. Such an approach includes considerations of: a) what goals are to be achieved; b) under what conditions; c) using which resources necessary for the learning experiences; and d) examining how well goals are achieved in relation to what changes need to be made (Brown, Lewis and Harcleroad, 1977).

A learner verification model is one in which formal measurement is postponed until verification of the instructional product can be worked out with the intended user in an informal way. Thiagarajan (1976) observed that although learner verification and revision (LVR) is being heralded as the latest instructional innovation, the concept has been in use since ancient times. In this project the two intended users were first, the workshop leader or teacher of reference and second, the participants in the workshop.

2. The Instruments of Verification

In order to meet the objectives of the instructional design plan, three types of evaluations were necessary. The first need was for subject specialists in the field of Speech Communication who could verify the project from the point of view of the content. A second verification was needed for teachers and/or in-service workshop leaders who could verify the teaching methodology. A third and final verification was needed in order to allow participants to verify the results of their learning experience.

Three instruments were designed to meet the needs of field testing and verification. (See appendix B.) The first instrument, termed "Content Evaluation" was a form consisting of six open-ended questions designed to check errors and inconsistencies in the subject matter of the workshops. Content evaluators were also asked for their overall reaction to the project. The second instrument, termed "Workshop Leader/Teacher Open-Ended Questionnaire," consisted of ten items to which the person conducting the workshop responded.

These ten open-ended questions were essentially concerned with how the workshop materials were utilized, problems encountered in use, suggestions for changes, and additional comments.

The third verification instrument, termed "Participation Workshop Evaluation," consisted of eight semantic differential questions on a scale of one to five and four open-ended questions. The first eight questions dealt with whether the topics covered were meaningful, the pace of the workshops, whether the information presented was easy or difficult, and generally what the participant felt he or she had gained from the learning experience. Four open-ended questions provided participants with an opportunity to expand on matters of desired change, what they had learned about their own communication style, and additional comments.

3. Verification Procedures

Seven prospective evaluators were contacted with six responding affirmatively to field-testing and verification. The seventh responded too late to be involved in the project. Thiagarajan (1976) suggests that, depending upon the material, the initial debugging can be completed with five to ten individual tryouts. The following types of sites were used: two university Speech Communication Departments for content verification; two university library sites for in-service verification; and two library education sites for reference course verification. Each evaluator was sent three video cassette tapes, Study Guide, multiple copies of supplementary materials, the appropriate verification instrument(s), and a cover letter. (See Appendix B for the cover letter.) Evaluators were asked to rate each program separately.

B. Results of Filed Testing and Verification

1. Content Verification

Both content evaluators returned verification responses. One answered the form which had accompanied the materials; the other answered in more general terms. The Project Director had the opportunity to visit with the latter individual in person. Each of the evaluators verified each of the video tape programs as requested.

Responses by the content evaluators were generally favorable as to the concepts and ideas presented. Criticisms and suggestions for change tended to be minor, but were, none-the-less, useful in the project evaluation and revision.

2. Group Leader Verification

Two of the four group leaders returned verification responses: one teacher of reference and one public services librarian in the university library. One answered the form which accompanied the materials; the other answered in more general terms. The Project Director had the opportunity to visit in-person with both evaluators. Both of the group leader evaluators verified each of the video programs as requested.

Generally, both evaluators liked the concept of the project; however, both encountered similar difficulties in its utilization. Some of the problems encountered by the workshop leader/teacher in attempting to utilize the Librarians Communicate project materials consisted of the following:

(a) The program was overlong and repetitious in places.

(b) Some points on the tape were not made clear, either because of an inaccurate statement or muffled sound.

(c) The role-plays in the studio lacked a sense of reality; although the librarian "actors" carried them off well.

(d) The presentation seemed overly simplistic at times, and one of the leaders had difficulty answering questions which arose as a result of the workshop.

(e) Some difficulty was encountered in carrying out the directions in the Study Guide, which seemed too tightly structured.

(f) One of the evaluators noted that participants felt manipulated in the sense that they first viewed a simulated communication activity on the screen and then were asked to participate in it themselves.

(g) Some technical problems with the tape itself were noted, but these were, for the most part, minor.

3. Participant Verification

Participants in the verification procedures of the Librarians Communicate project were ten professional public service/reference librarians from a large university library and twenty-four Graduate Library School students in an advanced reference class. The professional group covered the material in three workshop sessions, and the student group in five. The student group verified each of the three workshops as directed; the professional group rated the

three workshops as a whole. Both groups used the forms provided.

Of the three groups of evaluators, the participant group expressed the most criticism. Item number eight of the "Participation Workshop Evaluation" form functions as a kind of barometer for overall staisfaction with the workshop. A tally of this item on a scale of one to five, with one rated "poor" and five "excellent" provided the following results in response to the statement: "Generally, I found this workshop": In the professional group, who rated the entire sequence of workshops together, fifty percent rated the programs with a number two--or less than average. Fifty percent of the professional participants rated the entire program with a number three--or average. The student group who rated each of the programs separately responded as follows: For Tape I on Verbal Communication, 65% of the group rated it average, five percent above average, twenty precent below average, and ten percent of the participants rated it poor. For Tape II on Nonverbal Communication, sixty percent of the student group rated it average; thirty-six percent above average, and four percent below average. For Tape III on the Reference Interview sixty-five percent of the group rated it average, five percent above average, twenty percent, below average, and ten percent of the student group rated the third tape poor.

Many of the open-ended comments were similar to those expressed by the workshop leader/teacher evaluators. In addition, this group stressed more than the others the need for a more professional presentation. In response to the open-ended item on what the participants had learned about their own communication, all respondents, with the exception of one from each group, indicated that learning--or awareness, which is the beginning of change--had in fact taken place. This response was probably the most significant finding of the study. The next problem, then, became one of inviting expert opinion to aid in the revision of the program and to solve problems of presentation, pacing, and clarity.

C. Project Evaluation

When field testing and verification procedures were completed, a project evaluation team was assembled by the Project Director in order to evaluate the results of field testing and to make general recommendations about project revision. The directive to this group was to examine how well goals of the project had been achieved in relation to what changes needed to be made. This team was made up of the following personnel: From the Radio-TV-Film Bureau, The Program Projects Supervisor, the Assistant Director for Program Services, the Manager for Instructional Services, and the Administrative Assistant in charge of the ITV facility; and from the Office of the Executive Vice-President, the Director of University Instructional/Research and Development. Each member of the team was given copies of the

verification results and had an opportunity to review the Librarians Communicate video tape program and examine the Study Guide. The conclusions reached by this team and their recommendations regarding revision follow below.

The program had tried to support two types of learning methodologies through the use of video tape. The first of these was to provide the content for a series of workshops on communication at the reference desk of a library; and the second, to assist the workshop leader or teacher, through demonstration, in the use of simulation techniques. The primary consideration of the evaluation team was that only one of these goals could be successfully met within the limits of the project. Therefore, the first and strongest recommendation of the project evaluation team was:

1. That the video tape focus on the content of the workshop only, and that the material which dealt with demonstration on how to carry out participatory activities be omitted from the video portion. Directions for games and exercises should be confined to print format. This recommendation was based on the recognition that these demonstrations tended to pre-sensitize the audience as to expected outcomes, and to set a standard for failure. Additional recommendations were made, then, to strengthen the content goal of the workshop and were as follows:

2. That stronger dramatizations/visualizations be provided. For example, the illusion of role-play in the stark setting of the studio did not provide the kind of reality needed for the intended audience. Additional word displays should also be added in order to help clarify difficult concepts.

3. More individuals should be used in the roles of library patrons to provide interest, variety, and authenticity.

4. Individuals acting in parts, including the Project Director, needed to appear less nervous and more professional.

5. The overall pace of the workshops needed to be increased.

6. Since no one individual can teach in exactly the same manner as another, there should be more choice and flexibility in the activities which appeared in the Study Guide.

7. The amount of information should be reduced, expecially in the first two tapes. Too much data was presented for the video medium.

When the evaluation team had completed its report to the Project Director, they were asked whether this team should have been

assembled earlier--to react to script material prior to taping. One of the team members commented negatively and as follows: "The way people perceive things, and the context in which they put things change every day. That's the reason so many people get fired at the network level through no fault of their own--and why advertising agencies are revolving doors." A second member of the evaluation team supported this notion: "We're all very good at responding to what we see, after it's done. I think that everything that is on the tapes appears to me to be something that would have been well worth trying, if you were sitting down designing this project from the beginning."

D. Project Revision

1. The Video Program

Project revision consisted first of shortening and tightening the video portion of Librarians Communicate. The original three tapes were reduced to one three-part fifty-one minute tape. Content of the tape focused on the concept of immediacy, and background information about verbal and nonverbal communication was omitted. All portions of the tape which dealt with communication games and exercises were also dropped. Secondly, all scenes were taped in the Media Center of the Main University Library and a variety of "patrons" were used. More captions were added for emphasis and clarity of concepts. The first two programs were completely revised with almost entirely new scripts. The third tape on the Reference Interview was used as originally produced. An attempt was made to answer some of the questions which regularly arise during such workshops through an informal discussion with the two university reference librarians at the end of the second section. The overall pace of the presentation was considerably faster than the previous program.

2. The Printed Matter

The original Study Guide was expanded and relabeled "Instructional Manual." The Manual provides all of the information previously contained in the Study Guide in addition to detailed information and instructions regarding games and exercises, role-play activities, and discussions which may be used prior, during, and after each section of the tape is played. A number of options are provided depending on the size and nature of the group. Approximate time allowances are given, so that the group leader can determine how long the workshop should be. The original Study Guide provided exact structure for the workshops; the new revised Instructional Manual allows more flexibility.

This chapter has dealt with how the Librarians Communicate project was field tested, user verified, and then evaluated for

purposes of revision. It has also described the nature of these revisions and why they were deemed necessary. The next and final chapter, Chapter Four, will provide a summary of the project, note limitations of the study, make recommendations for further research, and explain the publicity given to the project.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

The purpose of this, the last chapter of the Final Report, is to summarize the study, note limitations and conclusions, and to make recommendations for additional research. In addition, this chapter will also describe dissemination efforts about the project. This chapter is followed by supplementary materials, including a Bibliography and Appendix materials.

A. Summary Statement

The purpose of the Librarians Communicate project was to develop a series of workshops dealing with interpersonal communication during the reference interview. These workshops were intended to be group participatory in nature, and were to be supported primarily through the medium of video tape, supplemented by printed materials. The project was developed by the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona in cooperation with the Radio-TV-Film Bureau of the University and the University Library.

The main goal of the project was to make available to teachers of reference and in-service workshop leaders, in a practical and usable format, the findings of the Project Director's dissertation study on a reference librarian's immediate and nonimmediate communication. Such a project was deemed significant based on a growing awareness among the profession regarding the role human communication plays in the reference interview. This concern has been well documented in current library literature dealing with reference service and the negotiation of the reference question.

Immediacy is a well researched construct, or concept, which deals with an individual's verbal and nonverbal communication. In the immediacy principle people are drawn toward that which they like and move away from that which they dislike. Immediacy is described in terms of specific verbal and nonverbal cues which, when clustered together in certain ways, may either draw a patron toward a reference librarian or push the patron away. Immediate cues represent a communication style which is easily learned, and one that can be integrated by many different personality types. A more open and immediate communication style is intended to help the reference or public service librarian establish a cordial and receptive climate with the user in the first few minutes of the reference interview--thus, encouraging dialog. It is a widely held belief among many reference librarians that, by establishing such a climate, the librarian may be better able to draw the patron out in the question-negotiation phase of the reference inquiry.

The initial project materials were developed using an instructional design plan and learner verification model. Such a plan requires a systematic approach to the development of instructional materials and a method of verifying these materials. Verification is carried out by those who will use them and intended for purposes of revision. The first products developed for the project were three video cassette tapes ranging in length from about forty-five minutes to twenty-five, and a Study Guide containing materials for use by the in-person group leader. These materials were developed using personnel from the University Library and the Radio-TV-Film Bureau during the period beginning December of 1976 through March of 1977. Each cassette was to provide the basis for a two-hour workshop in immediate communication skills, when used as directed in the Study Guide.

The content was structured so as to provide participants with information regarding general concepts about communication behavior as well as on the immediacy principle. In addition, a number of communication activities, which were participatory in nature, were demonstrated using two librarians from the University Library and the Project Director. The first tape dealt with verbal communication skills; the second, with nonverbal communication, and the third tape with the use of the immediacy principle in the reference interview, followed by patron comments.

Following the development of this package for the Librarians Communicate Project, the materials were sent out for field testing and verification to six sites. Three types of verification measures were developed: Subject specialist verification, in-person group leader verification, and workshop participant verification. Four of the six sites completed field testing and returned verification data. These sites consisted of two university Speech Communication Departments--and two user groups, consisting of one professional group and one Graduate Library School group. With the return of these materials the project director assembled a project evaluation team consisting of personnel from the Radio-TV-Film Bureau and the Office of Instructional Research and Development. Using the verification data which had been collected, this team made recommendations regarding the revision of the Librarians Communicate package.

The original package was restructured so that in completed form it consisted of one 51-minute three-part video tape and an expanded Instructional Manual. This package provided the basis for three two-hour workshops dealing with a reference librarian's immediate and nonimmediate communication during the reference interview. Changes which were made in the content of the tape and the explanation for these revisions are noted below:

1. The revised video tape was limited in content to information about the immediacy principle only. Information concerned with other constructs and general background information about communication, which had previously been included, was omitted in the interests of clarity.

2. All process-type activities, that is, participatory activities involving the laboratory-type experience were removed from the video format. Directions for these activities were retained in the Instructional Manual. The reasons for this change rested on the perception of the evaluation team that demonstrating such activities on tape presensitized the video audience in a way that may have created feelings of hostility and of being manipulated. In addition, such material also set a standard for failure, in that the process did not adequately allow for individual differences in teaching styles.

3. Finally, more dramatization and visualization was added to the video tape program. These changes included taping all of the project on location in the Media Center of the Main Library, increasing the number of "patrons," and adding visual word clarifications to many of the scenes. The overall pace of the tape was speeded up and the content tightened. The reason for most of these changes was to give a more professional appearance to the tapes, clarify concepts, and improve audience attention.

B. Limitations of the Study

The development of instructional technology materials using an instructional design plan and learner verification model appears to have worked well for the Librarians Communicate project. The Project Director recognized from the beginning that an attempt to deal with a subject as sensitive as a person's interpersonal communication would be difficult for group leaders not trained in the dynamics of group work. Developing such a program as a workshop package carried with it a high risk factor. However, the demonstrated need for such information and training within the profession appeared to make the undertaking worth the effort. The use of an instructional design plan and learner verification model minimized the risk of failure and made it practical to try out some ideas that might not otherwise have been feasible. Certainly one of the keys to the success of such a plan is to take the revision of materials seriously, and as the need dictates. In the case of the Librarians Communicate project, it would appear that through this process a number of potential problems were readily identified and corrected.

The extent to which all problems which may be encountered in the use of the workshops have been resolved remains unknown and therefore, is one of the limitations of the study. Time and budget

constraints did not allow for a second or third field testing and verification, followed by revision. Ideally, the plan should be on-going until such time as materials revision has reached some predetermined level of perfection. If carried to its ultimate point such a process surely becomes an expensive one--which is one of the limitations of all instructional design plans.

A second limitation of the study has to do with the construction of the learner verification responses. Most of the items were open-ended which made it difficult in the end to tally and quantify. Open-ended questionnaires carry with them the problem of a great deal of contradictory information. In the case of this project questions were sometimes disregarded entirely in favor of the individual evaluator making statements in his/her own way. Although learner verification does not call for rigorous statistical examination of the data, more precise instruments of evaluation would have made the final process of evaluation, not only easier, but more clearly and succinctly stated. There is always a place for individual expression, but such responses would be best limited to a final slot on the evaluation instrument.

C. Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of this project it is possible to conclude that it appears feasible to provide a participatory-type workshop on immediate communication skills for in-service workshop leaders and teachers of reference using the medium of video-tape, supplemented by printed materials. Responses from participants during field testing would indicate that some awareness or learning about their own communication had taken place as a result of the workshops. To what extent the video medium may have been merely the catalyst for such learning, or the instrument, was not determined in this study. It is also possible to conclude that, for purposes of this project, the medium of video tape was not effective in dealing with certain process concerns. Video did not prove to be an effective method for training the "how to" of conducting the laboratory experience. This factor may have been due to having tried to accomplish too much within the scope of the project; or, it may have been due to a lack of immediate feedback, which is an important element in such learning experience; or, it may have been due to some other more subtle and as yet undetermined elements. One must ultimately conclude as a result of the project experience that the medium is indeed the message. Not only do the media work us over completely, in the words of Marshall McLuhan (1967), but a specific medium will inevitably determine what types of learning may be effectively presented within its range of utilization. Understanding this range continues to be of prime importance to educators.

How successful the workshop leaders or reference teachers will be in using these materials, guided by printed instructions only, remains an unanswered question. There is an increasing awareness within the teaching profession generally that simulation and role-play techniques used within the classroom or workshop are, in many instances, a more viable learning experience than one limited to lecture format only. For this reason a number of teachers will have acquired skills which will be useful in facilitating the Librarians Communicate workshops. An attempt to gather data on this point will be made through the use of a questionnaire which will be included in the Instructional Manual. Such data may ultimately help to determine whether the project materials are sufficient in and of themselves, or whether additional training skills for the trainers would be desirable.

Continued research and development into instructional technology materials appears useful to the profession both for the teaching of new members and the updating of those previously educated. Video technology supplemented by printed materials represents one of the ways in which new ideas may be widely shared. The effect of such technology on learning, however, continues to need careful testing. If the instructional design plan and learner verification model are useful in the initial development of learning packages, there none-the-less, remains a need to test under experimental conditions the effect of these materials on the development of members and potential members of the library profession.

Some areas of inquiry are, for example: Do individuals trained in communication skills actually make more effective reference librarians? What, if any, is the effect of the Librarians Communicate workshops on the ability of individuals to relate more effectively to the public and to improve public relations in the library? Are there some personality factors which make individuals more, or less, receptive to communication or human relations training? These and other related questions pose new areas of inquiry and research for library educators.

It would appear that the development of instructional materials using the newer technology answers some needs only to raise additional questions. Perhaps the answer for library education lies as much in asking questions and searching for answers, as in the answers themselves. This is perhaps so because it is through this continued quest for answers, which typifies a library educators willingness to cope with the future, that the new breed of librarians will best grow and develop. And it is this new breed, as many have pointed out, who must learn to cope with an information center of the twenty-first century that may only remotely resemble today's notion of a library. Through our own willingness to experiment and to learn about the new media, library educators may help to develop in the new librarian,

the ability to cope with a future without shock.

D. Publicity

During the project year a number of ways were utilized to disseminate information about the Librarians Communicate project. Much of the information about the project was distributed locally or state-wide, with some regional dissemination. No national publicity has been undertaken to date; however, once the materials have been deposited with the National Audio Visual Library in Washington, D. C., every effort will be made to carry out the dissemination of information about the Librarians Communicate project at the national level. The nature of this effort will be covered at the end of Section D of this chapter.

1. Local and State-wide

Initial publicity consisted of two announcements that the grant award had been made to the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona. The first of these consisted of a brief article in Education Periscope, a publication of the College of Education, with state-wide distribution. In addition, a spot announcement, sponsored by Cele Petersons of Tucson, ran on Radio Stations KTUC and KFMM, September 8, 1976. This spot was carried as follows:

> Dr. Helen M. Gothberg
> You have been selected as our
> "Star of the Day"
> in recognition of
> your being named
> to receive a federal grant
> to develop video tape
> workshops for reference
> librarians.

Following the initial announcements of the grant award, other efforts were made to publicize the project on state and local levels. In the fall of 1976 the Project Director visited with members of the Tucson business community during a luncheon arranged by F. Robert Paulsen, Dean of the College of Education. In the spring of 1977 the University News Bureau released a two-page announcement regarding the progress of the Librarians Communicate project, which was distributed locally with a note to the media inviting additional contact. At the completion of the project in the Fall of 1977, the Project Director was interviewed by Mort Beach, Assistant Director of the News Bureau, for the radio program, "Accent on the University of Arizona," which is distributed throughout the state for rebroadcast.

2. Regional

During the joint meeting of the Southwestern and Mountain Plains Library Associations in Albuquerque in November of 1976, the project director participated in a Continuing Education Fair. At this event the names and addresses of individuals who would be interested in receiving additional information about the project materials when they became available were collected. These individuals will be so notified at the appropriate time.

3. National

Upon completion of all materials for the grant project, every effort will be made to publicize their availability nationally. The dissemination of this information will consist of the following activities:

a. Articles will be submitted for publication by the Project Director for both audiovisual and library journals.

b. An effort will be made to display and discuss the Librarians Communicate project materials during the upcoming annual conferences of the American Association of Library Schools and the American Library Association.

c. Deirdre Boyle will be contacted about the possibility of noting their availability in her column "Media Minded," which appears monthly in American Libraries.

d. Lastly, the Project Director's participation in regional and national association continuing education committees, including Southwestern Library Association, American Association of Library Schools and Reference and Adult Services Division of ALA will help to promote knowledge of these materials nationally.

The Librarians Communicate project was an attempt to develop a means of sharing broadly some of the newer concerns of the library profession through use of instructional technology. How well the project succeeded is yet to be fully understood. In the end, the project provided all of those concerned with it an opportunity to share in a unique educational experience. Hopefully, those who are the recipients of this learning will, through the use of these materials, share few disappointments and enjoy the many rewards of a creative group experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, James W., Richard B. Lewis and Fred F. Harcleroad. AV Instruction; Technology, Media, and Methods. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

Barnlund, Dean D. Interpersonal communication: Survey and Studies. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968

Butler, Pierce. "Survey of the Reference Field," in Reference Services, comp. Arthur Ray Rowland. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1964.

Galvin, Thomas J. "The Education of the NEW Reference Librarian," Library Journal, 100:727-730, April 15, 1975.

Goldberg, Alvin A. and Carle E. Larson. Group Communication; Discussion Processes & Applications. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Gothberg, Helen M. "User Satisfaction with a Librarian's Immediate and Non-immediate Verbal-Nonverbal Communication," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Denver, 1974.

Hutchins, Margaret. Introduction to Reference Work. Chicago: American Library Association, 1944.

McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore. The Medium is the Massage; An Inventory of Effects. New York: Bantam Books, 1967.

Mehrabian, Albert. Silent Messages. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1971.

Mosher, Frederic J. "A Sermon for Beginning Reference Librarians," in Reference Service, Comp., Arthur Ray Rowland. Hamden, Conn: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1964.

Mount, E. "Communication Barriers and the Reference Question," Special Libraries, 57:575-578, October, 1966.

Peck, Theodore P. "Counseling Skills Applied to Reference Services," RQ, 14:233-235, Spring, 1975.

Penland, Patrick R. Communication for Librarians. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Plummer, Linda. "Student Difficulty with the Subject Catalog Involving the Specificity Level of Subject Headings." Unpublished research paper, Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver, 1971.

Pritchard, Hugh. "Sensitivity at the Reference Desk," RQ, 10:49-50, Fall, 1971.

Ranganathan, S.R. "Reference Service and Humanism," in Reference Services, comp. Arthur Ray Rowland. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1964.

Sammet, Norman T. "Why Does that Man Stare at Me?" Library Journal, 94:156-157, January, 1968.

Shores, Louis. "Reference Becomes Learning: The Fourth 'R,'" in Reference Services, Comp.: Arthur Ray Rowland. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1964.

Swope, Mary Jane and Jeffrey Katzer. "Why Don't They Ask Questions?" RQ, 12:161-166, Winter, 1972.

Taylor, Robert. "Question-Negotiation and Information Seeking in Libraries, "College and Research Libraries, 29:178-194, May, 1968.

Thiagarajan, Sivasailam. "Learner Verification and Revision: What, Who, When, and How? Audiovisual Instruction, 21:18-19, January, 1976.

Vavrek, Bernard F. "A Theory of Reference Service," College and Research Libraries, 29:508-510, November, 1968.

_____. "Emergence of New Reference," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 10:109-115, Fall, 1969.

Wyer, James I. Reference Work. Chicago: American Library Association, 1930.

APPENDIX A

COLORADO SEMINARY
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
UNIVERSITY PARK • DENVER, COLORADO 80208

OFFICE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS / 303 • 753-2143

May 20, 1977

Helen M. Gothberg, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85719

Dear Dr. Gothberg,

I am glad you liked the brochure and am happy to grant permission on behalf of the University to you to use a slide or slides from it in your video tapes as requested in your letter of May 17. Good luck in the enterprise.

Cordially,

Bud Mayer
Director

A PRIVATE INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85719

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
1515 EAST FIRST STREET

(602) 884-3565

Dear Evaluator:

Your willingness to participate in the field testing or content evaluation of the Librarians Communicate Video Workshops is greatly appreciated. If you are evaluating the tapes as a workshop leader or teacher, please go over the study guide and preview the three video tapes prior to field testing. There are two evaluation tools for your use: one is the "Participant Workshop Evaluation" which is to be distributed to all members immediately following the final use of each tape. Stress to participants the importance of indicating which tape they are evaluating and the need to fill in this information on the evaluation form by circling the correct roman numeral. Please field test all tapes using the same group.

The second evaluation tool for use by workshop leaders and teachers is the "open-ended Questionnaire." Please fill out this form as directed for each video tape, being certain to indicate the tape under evaluation. Please express your honest opinions and encourage participants to do the same. The purpose of such field testing is to provide input that will allow the project director to assess both strengths and weaknesses of the program and to make revisions accordingly.

If you are evaluating three tapes as a content specialist--that is, if you are not field testing with a specific group of participants, please fill out the "Content Evaluation Form." My thanks for your help.

Please return all materials by .....

Sincerely,

Helen M. Gothberg

Helen M. Gothberg,
Project Director

APPENDIX B (continued)

Content Evaluation

Directions: Please indicate on a separate sheet of paper your reaction to each of the video tapes. Evaluate each tape separately and in relation to the printed materials in the study guide. I would very much appreciate your reaction to the following points:

1. Did you note any errors in the content of the video tape, and if so, will you please note them?

2. Did you note any errors in the content of the printed material, and if so, will you please note them?

3. Did you note any inconsistencies in the presentation either within the tape or in comparison with one of the other tapes in the series?

4. Was there anything about the performance or presentation of the material that annoyed or bothered you?

5. Are there other changes you would like to see made?

6. What is your overall reaction to this project?

APPENDIX B (continued)

WORKSHOP LEADER/TEACHER

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please answer the following questions as fully as possible on a separate sheet of paper. You will receive a follow-up phone call for additional discussion and clarification upon recipt of your written evaluation.

1. Please explain in some detail the number and nature of the participants with whom you used the video tape workshop. How were they chosen for the field test?

2. Please indicate how you used the workshop. Was it used in three or more sessions? How long did each session last? Was this a classroom setting, and if so, for what course?

3. Did you experience any technical problems in conducting the workshop, that is problems with the equipment and so on?

4. Did the instructions on how to conduct the workshop and utilize the materials seem clear and easy to follow? Please explain in detail as necessary.

5. Did you encounter other difficulties in conducting the workshop? Please elaborate.

6. Were there positive values noted as a result of the workshop? Please elaborate.

7. Generally speaking, how did you feel about the workshop?

8. Are there definite changes you would like to see made?

9. Are there definite aspects of the workshop you want to see retained?

10. Additional comments?

APPENDIX B (continued)

PARTICIPATION WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by drawing a circle around the number that seems most appropriate to you in your evaluation of the workshop experience. A space is provided on the second page for additional comments.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME

Librarians Communicate: I II III
(Circle One)

1. This workshop session was:

1	2	3	4	5
(helpful)				(not helpful)

2. The topics covered were:

1	2	3	4	5
(meaningful)				(meaningless)

3.

1	2	3	4	5
(well prepared)				(poorly prepared)

4. The materials utilized were:

5	4	3	2	1
(boring)				(interesting)

5. The pace of the workshop was:

5	4	3	2	1
(too fast)				(too slow)

6. I learned:

1	2	3	4	5
(a great deal)				(very little)

7. The information was:

1	2	3	4	5
(too difficult)				(too easy)

8. Generally, I found this workshop:

1	2	3	4	5
(poor)				(excellent)

APPENDIX B (continued)

9. The changes I would like to see made in this workshop are as follows:

10. The part of this workshop that I liked the most was:

11. As a result of this workshop I learned the following about my own communication:

12. Additional Comments: